

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 7, 21 to 24 and 31 to 44 are pending. New Claims 41 and 42 have been added to replace previously cancelled Claims 8 and 25, respectively. New Claims 41 to 44 are within the scope of the elected invention. Claims 31 and 32 have been cancelled. New Claims 43 and 44 are supported on page 3, lines 6 and 7, of the specification, and are dependent upon Claims 41 and 42, respectively.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to change its recitation of carrying step a) from "a pressure in the range of 1.5 to 10 bar" back to the original recitation of "a pressure of at least 1.5 bar".

Regarding the obviousness rejection based on Hill et al. in view of Matsumoto, applicant continues his traverse of such obviousness rejection, and incorporates herein the arguments and information from his traversal of the obviousness rejection set out in the amendment filed on March 1, 2010.

Matsumoto was cited in the rejection for teaching the use of higher pressure. Applicant's comments and information on page 10, line 21, to page 11, line 7, shows the different chemistry, etc., of Matsumoto and, hence, the nonrelevance of Matsumoto.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

Reconsideration, reexamination and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

April 8, 2010
Date

Virgil H. Marsh
Virgil H. Marsh
Reg. No. 23, 083

Fisher, Christen & Sabol
Suite 603
1156 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel.: 202 659-2000
Fax: 202) 659-2015